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**Lamar University – M.Ed. in Educational Technology Leadership**

## Reflections of Course-based Embedded Assignments

***Directions:*** In submitting your Course-based Embedded Assignment located in Appendix I of the Internship Handbook, you are required to complete a reflection of the identified assignments in your course wiki/e-portfolio. These reflections will be used to assist you in completing your EDLD 5388/5370 (\*Please note that course number changes in Fall 2010\*) Internship comprehensive exam final report. Students should use and cite their textbook references as well as two additional references when writing each reflection. The reflection must consist of statements regarding the knowledge you gained from the assignment and how the assignment helped you master the Technology Facilitator Standard(s) /Indicator(s).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course Number: | Course Name: | Course-based Embedded Hours(see Appendix I) |
| **EDLD 5362** | **Information Systems Management** | **10 hours** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Description of theAssignment/Performance Tasks(see Appendix I) | Analyze district technology after completing interviews with at least two school administrators who are involved with the planning and budgeting of technology. |
| * The knowledge you gained from the assignment. (2 points) * The relation of new information to Technology Facilitator Standards and Performance Indicators (2 points). * The relation of information gained to personal experience. (2 points) * Discussion at a critical level, not just recitation of facts. Discussion at a critical level means discussing things such as your opinion of the reading or experience, why you hold that onion, what you see wrong with the reading or experience, how you see the reading or experience is consistent or inconsistent with what you have learned so far, implications for the future, (4 ) * Insights into the patterns of interactions of colleagues.(2 points) * Group processes including: who had power, authority, or influence; who was participating and who was not, who was not included, how did you or another leader draw the silent participants out; was there confrontation, conflict, consensus, agreement, hurt feelings? (2 points) * Notations addressing the affective or feeling tone evident, concerns you noticed. (2 points) * Questions you have that you should research or about which you can seek expert advice from your campus-based supervisor or your professor. (2 points) * Issues that puzzle you. (2 points) | This course single handedly strengthened the relationship I have with my technology director and network administrator. These are the two individuals that assisted me for several weeks of this course. I did not feel like a teacher during the interview process with these two individuals rather I felt like a technology leader since most of the terminology and data provided to me was a language I was familiar with. In week 5, I showcased the information I learned about our districts technology. We submitted a slideshow presentation with narration. I used Keynote for the presentation and all the fancy transitions and pictures. Garageband was the software of choice for narration. In fact, I got the idea to use Garageband software from a list of resources found in *Using Technology with Classroom Instruction that Works*. I followed the link and discovered that most users prefer using Garageband due to the high quality sound and editing features. After completing voiceover, I exported the audio and presentation into a .mov file and uploaded it to YouTube for classmates and professors to view. I have to say that this was a very lengthy process especially since I had to record my voice over and over until it matched the timing of the slides. I’ve created PowerPoints and other multimedia presentations however I never used voice. After this course, I discovered that it probably would of been easier if I just used a screen capture tool (Camstudio) with my presentation full screen and then add my voice in instead of trying to time everything. Also, I logged on to the discussion board on the due date and realized that many other cohort students posted their examples and used various types of presentation tools. Although this class was challenging and investigative in nature, it was one that I enjoyed. I enjoy researching and explaining my findings in various media types rather than reflecting and writing about it. This activity allowed me to evaluate and present data that improve my professional practice. As mentioned before, I had to interview Roland Handy (technology director) and Ruben Cantu (district network administrator) in order to gather specific information about our SIS, planning, budgeting, and others technology related information. I learned so much information about our infrastructure, technology related costs, and most importantly how little funding is provided for technology professional development. This was an important discovery since I know that continuous staff training is the key to technology integration in K-12 education. I was amazed to learn that Teaching and Learning budget was $232,000, more than any other part of the budget. My question was, where exactly did that money go? I asked Mr. Handy why there are very little professional development opportunities available for technology? His response was that due to time constraints, many principals would rather not allow their core academic teachers miss out on instructional time. Instead they prefer the train-the-trainer method, which is not very effective in my opinion. Unless the professional development deals with the next version of state standardized test or new non-technology pedagogies, principals will not allow their precious to be away from their classroom. In the 2011 Horizon Report K-12 education, it states, “training in digital literacy skills and techniques is rare in teacher education and school district professional development program”. When I read that I agreed but to a certain extent. First thing you notice is that it says “school district professional development programs”. There are plenty of training opportunities around however school district tend to avoid them to focus on what them deem to be more important, TAKS/STAAR training. Mr. Handy told me “I wish we could change the state of mind of campus principals”. He admitted that he felt a lot of pressure from the superintendent and curriculum to abide by the principal requests. For a moment, I felt discouraged being that my dream job is become a technology director. This comment made me realize why my district does not have a position for a technology instructional specialist. Many times the creation of this position has been submitted to our board of directors and each time it has been shut down. Every year our Mercedes ISD includes the following in our technology needs section of the technology plan “The need for a District Technology Instructional Specialist” (MISD E-Plan). The golden question is how can Mr. Handy and I persuade board of directors and human resources to create such a position? I think the answer is quite simple, keep doing what I’m doing. With the assistance of Dr. Galvan, ACE director, we just completed phase 1 of the summer technology program that utilized my services as a technology instructional specialist. The pilot program drew a lot of attention and was considered successful. With this type of positive response, I firmly believe that the position for district technology instructional specialist will become a reality. Of course, my next step will be making sure I get that position!  Sources:  Horizon Report 2011. (n.d.). CoSN Home Page. Retrieved October 11, 2011, from <http://www.cosn.org/Default.aspx?TabId=6375>  Handy, R. (25 April 2011). Personal communication.  Mercedes ISD E-Plan 2010-2011. (n.d.). *Mercedes Independent School District*. Retrieved October 12, 2011, from http://misdtx.schoolwires.com/13932082722333390/FileLib/browse.asp?A=374&BMDRN=2000&BCOB=0&C=56930  Pitler, H. (2007). Nonlingustic Representation. *Using technology with classroom instruction that works* (p. 105). Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.  Williamson, J., & Redish, T. (2009). *ISTE's technology facilitation and leadership standards: what every K-12 leader should know and be able to do*. Eugene,OR: International Society for Technology in Education. |